



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SCHOOL REVIEW

A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

VOLUME XVIII
NUMBER 9

NOVEMBER, 1910

WHOLE
NUMBER 179

A SYMPOSIUM

ON THE VALUE OF HUMANISTIC, PARTICULARLY CLASSICAL,
STUDIES: THE CLASSICS AND THE NEW EDUCATION

III. THE CASE FOR THE CLASSICS

PAUL SHOREY
The University of Chicago

No subject is too stale for a "rattling speech," and the mere praise of the classics and the exposure of the adversary still supply good matter of rhetoric.¹ But this paper is to be printed, and I hope with the aid of foot-notes to make it a sufficient, though of course not exhaustive, historical résumé and a repertory of temperate arguments adapted to present conditions.² To this end I am prepared to sacrifice not only its temporary effect on an audience but any ambition I might feel to attain the symmetry and classicism of form which befit a classicist speaking in his own cause and which are so admirably illustrated in the apologies for classical studies of Mill and Jebb and Arnold.³

¹ Cf. Professor Forman's *Humble Apology for Greek*, Cornell University, 1904, printed privately.

² Cf. *infra*, pp. 600-1. Even in 1868 Professor Gildersleeve had to make the same point (*Essays and Studies*, 5: "Dr. Bigelow is fighting the shadows of the past," etc.—*Ibid.*, 10).

³ Mill, "Inaugural Address," *Dissertations and Discussions*, IV, 332 ff.; Jebb, *Essays and Addresses*, 506 ff.; *Humanism in Education*, 545 ff.; *Present Tendencies in Classical Studies*, 560 ff., 609 ff., 636; Arnold, "Literature and Science," *Discourses in America*, 172 ff. To these might be added Lowell's "Harvard

The situation has improved since I had the honor of speaking here fifteen or sixteen years ago, and many topics which I dwelt on then may be lightly enumerated today. The wearisome controversy has educated the participants on both sides.⁴ Both are more careful in their dialectic and more cautious in the abuse of exaggeration and irrelevancy.⁵ Our opponents have grown very shy of the kind of logic which delivered them into our hands, though they still grotesquely misconceive the nature and aims of our teaching.⁶ But only a few incorrigibles still harp on the false antithesis of words and things.⁷ The recollection of Lowell's eloquent protest (VI, 174) if nothing else would make them eschew the precious argu-

Anniversary Address," *Prose Works*, VI, 139, 160, 165: "Oblivion looks in the face of the Grecian Muse only to forget her errand," 166, 174; and *Latest Lit. Essays*, 139, the speech in which the greatest professor of modern languages told the Modern Language Association: "I hold this evening a brief for the modern languages and am bound to put the case in as fair a light as I conscientiously can." See the fine chapter on "Reading" in Thoreau's *Walden*. And for further bibliography of books and papers referred to in this address cf. *infra*, pp. 591, 587, 599.

⁴ Huxley (*Science and Education*, 83) stretched "nature" to include "men and their ways," and Arnold with more justice made "letters" include Copernicus and Darwin (their results, not their processes).

⁵ Huxley, *op. cit.*, 163; Jebb, *op. cit.*, 537. No rational advocate would now recommend either Latin or botany on the ground that it *exercises the memory*. See Gildersleeve, *op. cit.*, 28.

⁶ Cf. President David Starr Jordan, *Pop. Sci. Mo.*, 73 (1908), p. 28: "Once the student cuts entirely loose from real objects and spends his days among dialectical marks, irregular conjugations, and distinctions without difference his orientation is lost." So Tyndall once demanded "a culture which shall embrace something more than declensions and conjugations." What would President Jordan think of a classicist who characterized the study of science as cutting loose from human interests and counting fish-scales? See Zielinski's rebuke of Father Petroff, p. 200-1; Lowe, "Speech at Edinburgh," November 1, 1867: "We find a statement in Thucydides or Cornelius Nepos who wrote 500 years after and we never are instructed that the statement of the latter is not quite as good as the former. . . . The study of the dead languages *precludes the inquiring habit of mind which measures probabilities*" [sic]. Cf. *infra*, pp. 594-97.

⁷ Lowe at Edinburgh, November, 1867; Spencer, *passim*; Jordan, *Pop. Sci. Mo.*, 73 (1908), p. 29; cf. Youmans, 5, "The relation between words . . . and ideas . . . is accidental and arbitrary." Cf. *contra* Masson *apud* Taylor, p. 306; Mill, 347-8.

ment of Herbert Spencer and Lowe that Greece was such a little country, "no bigger than an English county." Some of them are beginning to apprehend the distinction between education and instruction, formation and information.⁸ And if any of them still believe that the intrinsic excellence of classical literature is a superstition of pedants they rarely venture to say so in public in the fearless old fashion of the *Popular Science Monthly*.⁹ We have won a victory at the bar of educated opinion in which we may feel some complacency, though we must beware of overestimating its practical significance. The man in the street has not changed his opinion of dead languages, and the great drift of American education and life toward absorption in the fascinating spectacle of the present has not been, perhaps cannot be, checked. A stream of tendency cannot be dammed by argument. As Professor James says: "Round your obstacle flows the water and gets there all the same."¹⁰ The majority still believe that modern civilization can find not only entertainment but also all the instruction and all the culture which it requires in the contemplation of moving pictures of itself whether in the five-cent theater or the ten-cent magazine or the one-cent newspaper. But among the thoughtful there is a reaction in our favor. They may not accept our estimates of the transcendental worth of the classic literatures or the unique discipline of classical studies. But they have lost forever the illusion that the mere suppression of Greek and Latin will bring in the educational

⁸ Gildersleeve, *Essays and Studies*, 13; Zielinski, 28; Brunetière, *Questions Actuelles*, 51 ff., 62, 74-75, 404-5.

⁹ 23, 701: "The Dead Language Superstition," a diatribe called forth by Mill's "Inaugural." See in like strain Mach, *Open Court*, November 22, 1894; Bierbower, "Passing of the Linguist," *N. E. Magazine*, n.s. 36, 246 ff.

¹⁰ For an effective answer to this fatalistic *vox populi vox Dei* argument, see Zielinski, *Our Debt to Antiquity* (Eng. trans., E. P. Dutton), 3-8; cf. Lowell, "Harvard Anniversary Address," *Works*, VI, 162: "I have seen several spirits of the age in my time," etc. Paulsen (II, 370) says that in 1770 Kant would never have foreseen that in 1820 Greek would lead science in the schools. Yet he himself ventures the prediction that a third renaissance of classics will never come (pp. 634-35).

millennium.¹¹ They are observing with mixed feelings a Greekless generation of graduates and wondering what a Latinless generation will be like. They admit with some natural reserves the breakdown of the elective system.¹² They recognize that a real education must be based on a serious, consecutive, progressive study of something definite, teachable, and hard.¹³ And while they may not agree with us that no good substitutes for Greek and Latin and the exact sciences can be found, they are not quite so certain as they were that sociology, household administration, modern English fiction, short stories as a mode of thinking, and modern French and German comedies are "equally as good." Thirty or fifty years ago they could contrast with our ideal the actual results of that classical training for which we claimed so much.¹⁴ It is now our turn to challenge the results of the new system.¹⁵

Addressing myself to a generation thus chastened in spirit and exercised in the dialectics of educational controversy, I need not do more than enumerate some of the hoary fallacies and irrelevancies which it was once necessary to refute in detail. I may take it for granted that we must compare either ideals with ideals or actualities with actualities; that from the standpoint of the ideal all subjects are badly taught, imperfectly learned, and quickly forgotten;¹⁶ that the clas-

¹¹ "Harking Back to the Classics," *Atlantic Mo.*, 101 (1908), 482; L. R. Briggs, "Some Old-fashioned Doubts about New-fashioned Education," *Atlantic Mo.*, 86, 463; Williams, *School Review* (1909), 383-84. Gayley, *Idols of Education*; Barrett Wendell, *The Mystery of Education*; see Brunetière, *op. cit.*, 399-400.

¹² Already Lowell, *op. cit.*, VI, 161; cf. Shorey, "Discipline in Education," *Bookman*, March, 1906. See the entire recent literature of dissatisfaction with the colleges.

¹³ Huxley, *op. cit.*, 414; cf. already the admirable words of De Morgan in Youmans, *The Culture Demanded by Modern Life*, 442.

¹⁴ See *Contemp. Review*, xxxv, 833.

¹⁵ Paulsen in *Educat. Review*, xxxiii, 39, says (of classics) that we must consider what the average graduate gets, not ideals. Well, what has the average graduate been getting from the "bargain-counter, sample room, *à la carte*" system of the past two decades?

¹⁶ Cf. Barrett Wendell, *The Mystery of Education*, 143. On the attempt to limit education to what all "educated" men remember cf. Zielinski, p. 27.

sics are on the whole among the better-taught subjects,¹⁷ and that middle-aged business men who complain that they cannot read Greek and Latin for pleasure would not distinguish themselves if examined on mediaeval history, conic sections, old French, organic chemistry, or whatever else they happened to elect in college. As George Eliot says, "the depth of middle-aged gentlemen's ignorance will never be known for want of public examinations in this branch." It is known in the case of the classics only because they regret that they have lost them and so betray themselves.

Similarly we may assume a general recognition of the distinction between the higher and the lower sense of "practical,"¹⁸ of the fact that the most practical of studies are useful only to those who are to use them,¹⁹ and of the repeated testimony of business and technical men that the actual knowledge gained in preparatory college courses in their subjects is of little value.²⁰

Again everybody except President Stanley Hall is now aware that the phrase "dead language" is not an argument but a question-begging epithet or a foolish, outworn, metaphor.²¹

¹⁷ Cf. *Andover Review*, V, No. 2 (1884), 83; Huxley, *op. cit.*, 153; Professor Alexander Smith, in *Science*, XXX, 457-66: "Every conclusion is tested and every element in problem-solving by the scientific method is covered. . . . The method is simple, yet of unquestionable efficiency. A method so simple and certain has not yet been devised for history, literature, political economy, or chemistry."

¹⁸ Cf. *Cambridge Essays* (1855), 291; W. F. Allen, *Memorial Volume*, 129, "Practical Education"; Forman, *op. cit.*, 7-9; Clapp, *Overland*, XXVIII, 94.

¹⁹ Huxley, *Science and Ed.*, 316-21, rejects histology, comparative anatomy, and materia medica as of no practical use to the physician. Cf. Brunetière, *op. cit.*, 401; Jacob Bigelow, "Remarks on Classical and Utilitarian Studies," 1867, with the answer in *No. Am. Rev.*, CIV, 610.

²⁰ Loeb, *School Rev.* (1909), 373, "But thirteen years' experience in very active affairs taught me that the time spent at Harvard studying history of finance . . . might as well have been devoted to the classics for all the *practical* value I got." "Où sont aujourd'hui la physique, la chimie, la physiologie d'il y a trente ans seulement, et qu'en connaissons-nous pour les avoir étudiées au collège, et depuis oubliées?"—Brunetière, *op. cit.*, 94.

²¹ Cf. Fouillée, 125, on Raoul Frary's "Culture of Dead Wood." "A dead language is the dead sea of thought"—*Pop. Sci. Mo.*, xvii, 148. Cf. in Butler's *Erewhon*, the satire on "Colleges of Unreason given over to the study of the

Lastly, the right use and limits of translations are no longer likely to be misunderstood. Few will now be misled either by Labouchère's statement that Bohn's translations had shown up the classics, or Emerson's saying that he would as soon swim when there was a bridge as resort to the original in place of a translation; or Professor Moulton's argument that translations are as good as the originals for the teacher of "general" literature. And though we sometimes meet the fallacy that posed Gibbon's aunt, the argument that the student's own version is inferior to the printed translations of great scholars which he might use instead, it is merely as Gibbon says "a silly sophism which could not easily be confuted by a person ignorant of any language but her own." There is no opposition between the use of translations and the study of the original. On the contrary even a little acquaintance with the original adds immensely to their usefulness. They are tools which are best employed by those who have some insight into the method of their construction.²² For some purposes they may be almost as good as the originals. But among the purposes for which they are not so good are classroom discipline, the development of the critical intelligence and the habit of exactness, and the maintenance of high standards of national taste and culture in the educated classes.²³

Hypothetical Language"; the elaboration of the same old jest in another form by Professor Scott, *Ed.*, XVI, 360, and Spencer's constant recourse to the argument.

For the retort crushing on the "dead languages" argument, cf. the eloquent words of D'Arcy W. Thompson in *Day Dreams of a Schoolmaster*; Lowell, *op. cit.*, VI, 165; "If their language is dead, yet the literature it enshrines is rammed with life as perhaps no other . . . ever was or will be."—Bryce, *School Rev.* (1909), 369; Postgate's Liverpool Inaugural Lecture on "Dead Language and Dead Languages," 1–10; *ibid.*, 12; 85 per cent of "Ido" is intelligible to an Englishman who knows—Latin. For the superior educational value of a synthetic, classic, or a "dead" language, cf. Jebb, *op. cit.*, 621; Gildersleeve, *op. cit.*, 27–28; Mill, *op. cit.*, 352–53; Zielinski, *op. cit.*, 33 ff.; Laurie, 10; *infra*, p. 598.

²² Cf. President Mackenzie, *School Rev.* (1908), 378–80; Zielinski, *op. cit.*, 112.

²³ Cf. Gildersleeve, *op. cit.*, 20, *A. J. P.*, XXX, 353; Mill, *op. cit.*, 350; Clapp, *op. cit.*, 100; Zielinski, *op. cit.*, 85, 87; T. Herbert Warren, *Essays on Poets and Poetry*, III; Wilamowitz, *Introduction to "Hippolytus": Was ist Uebersetzen?*; Paul Cauer, *Kunst des Uebersetzens*, 4th ed., 1909; Diels, *Heraikleitos*: "Uebersetzen ist Spiel oder, wenn man will, Spielerei."

In addition to all this controversial and negative work, we may take for granted the conventional positive and constructive arguments for classical studies elaborated by a long line of able apologists, except so far as we have occasion to summarize or refer to them in the course of this review.²⁴

These arguments are not exclusive but cumulative. The case of the classics does not rest on any one of them and is not impaired by the exaggerated importance that mistaken zeal may attribute to any one. Those who still harp on the superiority of the classics as discipline²⁵ do not therefore "tacitly acknowledge themselves beaten on the point of their intrinsic value"²⁶ and those who prefer to emphasize the "necessity of the ancient classics" for the understanding of modern life and letters²⁷ may still believe that high-school Latin is the best instrument of discipline available in secondary education.²⁸

The March number of the *Classical Journal* tabulates the aims of classical study as stated by teachers in response to a *questionnaire*. Thirty teachers aim at mental training, 29 at literary appreciation, 26 at power of expression, 26 at the rela-

²⁴ See *supra*, p. 585, n. 3; *infra*, p. 613-17. For some earlier apologies and discussions see Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship*, II, 18, 51, 71, 125, 130, 151, 171, 181, 209, 256; also the writers quoted in Taylor, *Classical Study: Its Value Illustrated* (Andover, 1870). Cf. further W. G. C. in *Cambridge Essays* (1855), 282; *Essays on a Liberal Education* (1867); Arnold in *Higher Schools in Germany*, and *A French Eton*; Field, Lyttleton, and Rendall in *Essays on Education* by members of the XIII (London, 1891); Goodwin, *Educ. Rev.*, IX, 335; Postgate, "Are the Classics to Go?" *Fortnightly*, LXXVIII, 866 ff.; West, "Must the Classics Go?" *N. A. Rev.*, CXXXVIII, 151; Kelsey, "Position of Latin and Greek in American Education," *Educ. Rev.*, XXXIII, 162; Clapp, *Overland*, XXVIII, 93 ff.; T. Rice Holmes, "The Crusade Against the Classics," *National Rev.*, XLII, 97 ff.; Freeman in *Macmillan*, LXIII, 321 ff.; Andrew Lang in *Living Age*, CCXLV, 765 ff.; J. C. Collins, *Fortnightly*, LXXXIII, 260 ff.; T. E. Page, *Educ. Rev.*, XXXIV, 144; Manatt, *N. Y. Evening Post*, August 18, 1906; Anatole France, "Pour le Latin," *Vie littéraire*, I, 281; Brunetière, "La question du Latin," *Revue des deux mondes*, Dec. 15, 1885.

²⁵ E.g., Professor Sidney G. Ashmore, *The Classics and Modern Training*, chap. i. See *supra*, p. 588, n. 11-12.

²⁶ Gildersleeve, *op. cit.*, 15.

²⁷ Gildersleeve, *South. Quart.*, XXVI, 145.

²⁸ Cf. Bennett and Bristol, *The Teaching of Latin and Greek*, chap. i, and Bristol in *Educ. Rev.*, XXXVII, 243-51.

tion of the ancients to us, 26 at ability to read, 15 at general linguistic training, 8 at grammar, 6 at acquaintance with Greek and Latin literature. Obviously there is nothing incompatible in these aims. It is a question of emphasis, the needs of the class, the ability, training, and tastes of the teacher. A faddist may ride his hobby to death, whether it be optatives, or lantern slides, or parallel passages from the poets. But in return, the good teacher will almost in the same breath translate a great poetic sentence, bring out its relations to the whole of which it is a part, make its musical rhythm felt by appropriate declamation, explain a historical or an antiquarian allusion, call attention to a dialectic form, put a question about a peculiar use of the optative, compare the imagery with similar figures of speech in ancient and modern poetry, and use the whole as a text for a little discourse on the difference between the classical and the modern or romantic spirit; so that you shall not know whether he is teaching science or art, language or literature, grammar, rhetoric, psychology, or sociology, because he is really teaching the elements and indispensable prerequisites of all.

Similarly of the diverse considerations urged by former apologists and the contributors to these symposia. The case of the classics rests on no one taken singly but on their conjoint force, and it is not really weakened by the disproportionate stress sometimes laid on the weaker arguments. The illumination of scientific terminology, for example, is a minor and secondary utility of a little knowledge of Greek and Latin on which the biologist or physician is especially apt, perhaps over much, to insist. That is his contribution. He does not mean to rest the case on that. He is not answered by the argument that "ten or twelve years" of study is too big a price to pay for this result and that terminology can be learned from glossaries. For a very slight knowledge of the languages makes an immense difference in the intelligence with which the dictionary or the glossary of scientific terms is consulted and the vividness with which its statements are realized. One or two years will yield a good deal of that particular utility, and the question for the teacher of science or medicine is whether any other *non-*

professional college study is likely to be more "useful" to his students.²⁹ So in arguing that the classics give the engineer a power of expression which he requires for use as well as for ornament, Professor Sadler³⁰ is not committing himself or us to the proposition that none but classicists write well and all classicists do. He simply means what all experience proves, that the study of the classics is on the whole an excellent training in expression,³¹ perhaps a better one than the unpremeditated effusions of "daily themes,"³² and that discipline in the power of exact and lucid expression is a utility for the engineer.³³ Again, Mr. Kelsey would be the last to rest the case for the classics on the fact that the wider secondary study of Greek would leave the door of choice for the profession of the ministry open to a large number of desirable candidates who now find too late that they lack the indispensable preparation.³⁴ But it is a real if minor consideration to be counted in the sum.

All of these contributions from the professions take for granted the general discipline and cultural values of the classics, and presuppose the fact pointed out by Mr. Loeb and others, that the direct business and technical utilitarian value of the so-called practical college courses is very slight. On this assumption, they supplement the ideal values of the classics by showing that, in the jargon of modern pedagogy, they also possess "adjustment values" for other professions than theology and literature.

One consideration, however, which constantly recurs in these discussions is fundamental. It is the training which the classics

²⁹ See Dr. Vaughan in *School Rev.* (1906), 392.

³⁰ *School Rev.* (1906), 402-5.

³¹ A writer in *Educ. Rev.*, XXXVIII, 88-90, argues that the difference of pronunciation makes Latin useless to the English of the high-school student.

³² Cf. Mr. Barrett Wendell's sad surmise (*The Mystery of Education*, 175) that perhaps the reason why the up-to-date Harvard student doesn't write like Addison is that Addison "had never studied English composition as a thing apart." But Addison had studied Latin composition and had a very pretty knack of turning Latin verses.

³³ Cf. *Outlook*, XCIII (1907), 87.

³⁴ *School Rev.* (1908), 567-79.

give in the art of interpretation. Classicists sometimes claim for and scientific men concede too much to the study of the classics as a means of developing the powers of expression.³⁵ They underestimate its value as a discipline of the intelligence.³⁶ They appreciate its stimulus to emotion. They fail to apprehend its subtler effect in blending and harmonizing the two—suffusing thought with feeling, informing feeling with thought. In controversy Huxley and Tyndall were fond of pointing out that the leaders of science expressed themselves with rather more vigor, point, and precision than the ordinary classicist. And their own vivid and fluent eloquence drove the argument home. In general, however, men of science are only too ready to concede with the irony which apes humility that their training has not supplied the graces and literary refinements that are supposed to qualify a man to shine after dinner or to make a good appearance on the platform. But the gifts of eloquence and fluency are sparks of natural endowment which science perhaps quite as often as philology fans into flame.³⁷ Scientific men may make haste to forget their Latin as Latin. But the mere classicist observes with admiring despair their mastery of the polysyllabic Latinized vocabulary of English. Where he says “if so” they say “in the contemplated eventuality.” We must abate our claim that only the classics make men eloquent and emphatic in the expression of their own thoughts.

But it is impossible to claim too much for them as a discipline in the all-important art of interpreting the expressed

³⁵ Huxley, *op. cit.*, 130.

³⁶ Bentley's *Dissertation on Phalaris*, the type and model of philological method, has been aptly styled “a relentless syllogism.” No one can compare the discourses of Renan and Pasteur at the French Academy or the Romanes lectures of Jebb (1899) and Professor Lankester (1904) without feeling that the superiority of the trained classical philologist is not solely or mainly “in the graces.” It is in the intellectual qualities of subtlety, wit, sanity, breadth, coherence, and closeness of cogent dialectic that his advantage is most conspicuous. As we are speaking of “disciplinary values” it would be beside the mark to allege what Renan and Jebb would be the first to admit, that Pasteur's work was of greater service to mankind than theirs.

³⁷ On the bad style of classicists cf. *Pop. Sci. Mo.*, I. 707; Gildersleeve, *op. cit.*, 49; Spencer, *Study of Sociology*, 267.

thought of others. There is no other exercise available for educational purposes that can compare in this respect with the daily graduated critical classroom translation and interpretation of classical texts.³⁸ The instinctively sane judgment of intended meanings, the analytic power of rational interpretation—these, natural gifts being equal, are the distinctive marks of the student of classics, in varying degrees, from the secondary-school Latinist, who at least has some inkling of the general implicit logic and structure of language, to the collegian who has been exercised in the equivocations of idiom and synonym, and the finished master who can weigh all the nice considerations that determine the precise shade of meaning or tone of feeling in a speech in Thucydides, a lyric of Aeschylus, a half-jesting, half-serious argument in Plato. Information, knowledge, culture, originality, eloquence, genius may exist without a classical training; the critical sense and a sound feeling for the relativity of meaning rarely if ever. I have never met in private life or encountered in literature a thinker wholly disdainful of the discipline of the classics who did not betray his deficiency in this respect. I say in all seriousness that what chiefly surprises a well-trained classicist in the controversial and popular writings of scientific men, especially in the case of the pseudo- or demi-sciences,³⁹ is not any awkwardness of style or defect in “culture,” but the quality of the dialectic and logic, the irrelevancies, the elaborations of metaphors from illustrations into arguments,⁴⁰ the disproportionate emphasis upon trifles and truisms,⁴¹ the

³⁸ The argument of Webster (*Forum*, XXVIII, 459 ff.) that the study of a language makes almost no demands upon the reasoning powers refutes itself; cf. Jebb, *op. cit.*, 558; Laurie, *Lectures on Languages and Linguistic Method*, 9-10; Fouillée, 102-3.

³⁹ Illustrations of this point are too numerous to quote here, but the repeated misapprehensions of Plato's plainest meanings in *Education as Adjustment*, 19, 62, 63, 90, by M. V. O'Shea, professor of the “science” and art of education in the University of Wisconsin, are typical. If such are the standards of accuracy and criticism of the professor of the science, what will be those of the novices?

⁴⁰ Huxley, *Science and Education*, 81 ff.; Spencer, *passim*; Dr. George E. Dawson, “Parasitic Culture,” *Pop. Sci. Monthly*, September, 1910.

⁴¹ Cf. in *Culture Demanded by Modern Life* Paget's page on the “certainty that continual or irregular feeding is contrary to the economy of the human stomach.”

ignoring of the issue,⁴² the naïve dependence on authority,⁴³ the outbursts of quaint unction and ornate rhetoric,⁴⁴ the constant liability to stumble like a child, or quibble like a sophist,⁴⁵ with regard to the fair presumptive meaning of alien, divergent, or hostile utterances.⁴⁶ There is for them no intermediate between the rigid, unequivocal scientific formula and mere rhetoric or sophistry, because they have never been trained to the apprehen-

⁴² E.g., Huxley's extension of "nature" to include "men and their ways," and the fashioning of the affections and of the will," *Science and Education*, 83.

⁴³ Typical examples are the use that they make as ultimate authorities of Grote's *Plato*, Lewes' *Biographical History of Philosophy*, Lange's *History of Materialism*, and Draper's *Intellectual Development of Europe*. Cf. Tyndall, *Belfast Address*, "And I have entire confidence in Dr. Draper." Huxley on the study of zoölogy: "What books shall I read? None; write your notes out; come to me for the explanation of anything that you cannot understand." Neither Youmans nor Herbert Spencer could ever be brought to admit the gross error into which Spencer was led (*Data of Ethics*, § 19), by misinterpreting Bohn's mistranslation of Plato's *Republic*, 339D. For another example, cf. Jhering *ap. Zielinski*, 111. Huxley's contrast between history and laboratory science (p. 126) is fallacious. He fails to see that the student of science innocently transfers to literature, history, and language his habit of accepting on faith all experimental results outside of his particular specialty, while the student of classical philology acquires the habit of testing by the original evidence every statement that he hears from his teacher or reads in his textbooks. Cf. Smith, *supra*, p. 589, n. 17; Fouillée *op. cit.*, 62-63, 109.

Those who repeat (e.g. Webster, *Forum*, XXVII, 453) after Spencer (*Education*, 79) that classical training establishes the habit of blind submission to the authority of grammar, lexicon, or teacher simply do not know what goes on in a good classroom. See Zielinski, *op. cit.*, 90-92. Cf. the noble passage in Mill, *op. cit.*, IV, 355, on the spirit of inquiry in Plato and Aristotle which Huxley (*op. cit.* 211), transfers *verbatim* to science, ignoring the all-important qualification, "on those subjects which remain matters of controversy from the difficulty or impossibility of bringing them to an experimental test." Cf. Jebb, appendix to *Sophocles O. T.*, 219. "It is among the advantages and the pleasures of classical study that it gives scope for such discussions as this passage (*O. T.*, 44-45) has evoked."

⁴⁴ "The suction pump is but an imitation of the first act of every new-born infant, nor do I think it calculated to lessen that infant's reverence . . . when his riper experience shows him that the atmosphere was his helper in extracting the first draught from his mother's bosom" (Tyndall, on the "Study of Physics.")

⁴⁵ Paget, *op. cit.*, p. 183: "The student of nature's purposes should surely be averse from leading a purposeless existence."

⁴⁶ Spencer, *passim*; Huxley, *op. cit.*, 144: "If their common outfit draws nothing from the stores of physical science." Both Mill and Arnold insist on acquaintance with the *results* of science. Cf. too Huxley's substitution of

sion of all recorded speech as a text whose full meaning can be ascertained only by a critical, historical, and philological interpretation of the context. The way in which the classics provide us with this training can be fully appreciated only through experience.⁴⁷ I have attempted a description elsewhere in this journal,⁴⁸ and it has often been set forth by others, and most admirably by the representatives of the law in these symposia.⁴⁹ The law itself is the only discipline comparable to the classics in this regard.⁵⁰ But while more severe perhaps and strictly intellectual it is narrower in its range⁵¹ and does not include the union of feeling and intelligence which makes the study of the classics an incomparable method of general education. For this reason though the law would be the best available substitute for the discipline of the classics, thoughtful lawyers would be the last to advocate the substitution.

But it is time to turn from these special considerations to a broader view of the whole subject. Classical education is not an academic superstition, an irrational survival of the Renaissance.⁵² It is a universal phenomenon of civilization. Higher non-vocational education has always been largely literary and linguistic, and it has always been based on a literature distinguished from the ephemeral productivity of the hour as classic. It was so at Rome, in China, in Hindustan, and among the Arabs. The Greeks, whose supreme originality makes them an exception to every rule, are only an apparent exception to

Middle Ages for Renaissance (*ibid.*, 149–50) and his consequent contradiction of his own admission on p. 209, “that the study of classical literature familiarized men with ideas of the order of nature.”

⁴⁷ Zielinski, *op. cit.*, 31 ff.

⁴⁸ V, 225–29.

⁴⁹ Cf. Starr on the discipline of the judgment and training in the interpretation of texts, *School Rev.* (1907), 412, 415; Evans, *ibid.*, 421. Foster, *ibid.* (1909), 377–79.

⁵⁰ Whewell adds that it is like mathematics, essentially deductive. Without committing ourselves to the “inductive method of learning languages” we may say that the interpretation of a classic text is often an excellent exercise in “inductive-observant” thinking.

⁵¹ Hutchins, *ibid.* (1907), 427–28.

⁵² For this commonplace see *infra*, p. 601.

this—they studied Homer⁵³ and their own older classics to form, not inform, their minds.⁵⁴ This universal tendency is only in part explained by the religious or superstitious reverence for sacred texts. It is in the main due to an instinctive perception of the principles on which the case for the classics still rests. The education of those who can afford time for non-vocational study is not in the narrower or more immediate sense of the words a “preparation for life”⁵⁵ but, from the point of view of the individual, a development of the faculties; from the point of view of society, the transmission of a cultural, social, moral tradition.⁵⁶ It must be a broad discipline of the intellectual powers that shall at the same time attune the aesthetic and the moral feelings to a certain key.⁵⁷ No study but that of language and literature can do this, and it is best done through an older and more synthetic form of language and a literature that is, in relation to the student and his environment, classic.⁵⁸ This is the meaning of the late W. T. Harris’s somewhat cryptic Hegelism that self-alienation is necessary to self-knowledge.⁵⁹ Or to put it more concretely, the critical interpretation or translation of such a language supplies the simplest and most effective all-round discipline of the greatest number of faculties. The ideal form and content of such a

⁵³ Cf. Bréal, 553: “On oublie qu’ils avaient leur antiquité dans l’épopée.”

⁵⁴ Cf. Bain, *Contemp. Rev.*, xxxv, 837: “The fact that the Greeks were not acquainted with any language but their own . . . I have never known any attempt to parry this thrust.”

⁵⁵ For such tautologous formulas as definitions of education cf. my “Discipline in Modern Education,” *The Bookman* (March, 1906), 94; to the list there given add “Adjustment,” which obviously includes everything and therefore anything.

⁵⁶ See Brunetière, *op. cit.*, 406, and the admirable work of Fouillée, *Education from a National Standpoint*, in Appleton’s “International Education Series,” p. 54. and *passim*.

⁵⁷ Arnold’s “relating what we have learnt . . . to the sense for conduct and the sense for beauty.”

⁵⁸ “There are five times as many mental processes to undertake in translating from Latin and Greek into English as there are in translating a modern language.” Lord Goschen; cf. *supra*, n. 21; *infra*, n. 99.

⁵⁹ “Self-alienation which consists in projecting one’s self into the idoms of a dead language,” etc., etc.—P. R. Shipman, *Pop. Sci. Mo.*, XVII, 145.

literature elevated above the trivialities, disengaged from the complexities, disinterested in the conflicts of contemporary life⁶⁰ awakens the aesthetic and literary sense,⁶¹ ennobles and refines feeling.⁶² And the very definition of classic implies that it is the source and chief depository of the national tradition either of religion or culture or both.

For modern Europe these conditions were fulfilled by the study of the classics of Greece and Rome which the Renaissance established in the face of a scholasticism that called itself science,⁶³ and which, adapted to altered conditions, we have still to defend against the exclusive pretensions of sciences that, uninformed by the temper of humanism, threaten to renew the spiritual aridity if not the intellectual futility of scholasticism.

The debate which began in the reaction from the Renaissance and found its first notable expression in the famous "quarrel of the ancients and moderns" is now more than two hundred years old.⁶⁴ New arguments are hardly discoverable at this date.

⁶⁰ Gladstone *ap.* Jebb, 570.

⁶¹ Jebb, 526. Cf. the definition of education as the aesthetic revelation of the world.

⁶² "Much lost I, something stayed behind,
A snatch maybe of ancient song;
Some breathing of a deathless mind,
Some love of truth, some hate of wrong."—*Ionica*.

⁶³ Cf. *University of Illinois Studies*, III, No. vii, p. 29.

⁶⁴ Not to speak of the polemic of the more illiberal Christian fathers against "pagan" studies, the controversy could be traced back to the opposition of scholasticism and the arts in the mediaeval universities; cf. *Univ. of Ill. Studies*, III, No. vii, pp. 19, 27 ff. Or we could begin in full Renaissance with the humanist Vives, advocate of the study of the vernacular; with Bacon, who, though himself widely read in the classics and writing in Latin, is the chief source of the rhetoric of the eighteenth and nineteenth-century polemic of scientific men against the classics; or, better yet, with Descartes, who anticipates by two hundred years the type of Spencer and Youmans and President Stanley Hall. Cf. in Cousin, X, 375, his funny letter to Madame Elizabeth deploring Queen Christina's enthusiasm for Greek. So Spencer more in sorrow than in anger comments (*Autobiog.*, II, 183) on Mills' Inaugural which Youmans quotes not quite ingenuously (*Gildersleeve, op. cit.*, 11). It is easy to cite sporadic denun-

At the most we may endeavor to weigh the old ones with more discretion, adapt them to the present conditions, and throughout to insist on a vital distinction which defines the issue today. I refer to the distinction between past adjustments or reductions of exclusive or excessive claims of classical studies and present efforts and tendencies to abolish them altogether. Here, as often, a quantitative distinction becomes qualitative, a difference of de-

ciations of the exclusive study of the classics and satire of bad teaching from the writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Sir Thomas Browne, himself steeped in the classics, incidentally writes, anticipating Spencer, in the style of Macaulay: "'Tis an unjust way of compute, to magnify a weak head for some Latin abilities and to undervalue a solid judgment, because he knows not the genealogy of Hector." Cf. Rigault's well-known book; Macaulay's "Essay on Sir William Temple"; Jebb's Bentley; Brunetière, *Époques*, 220; René Doumie, "La Manie de la Modernité, *Études de Litt. Française*, III, 1-23; Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship*, II, 403 ff. For the eighteenth century in France with its strange transition from dying pseudo-classicism to the second classical renaissance, see the excellent work of Bertrand, *Fin du Classicisme*, and for Germany, see Paulsen, *Geschichte des Gelehrten Unterrichts*, II. In nineteenth-century controversy the chief epochs are marked by (1) Sydney Smith's "Too Much Latin and Greek," *Ed. Rev.* (1809)—mainly an attack on Latin verse, etc. Anticlassicists quote from it at second hand "the safe and elegant imbecility of classical learning." They should also quote, "up to a certain point we would educate every young man in Latin and Greek." (2) Macaulay, "The London University," *Ed. Rev.* (1826), a political tract against the Tory opposition in Macaulay's most extreme rhetorical style. With the "Essay on Bacon" it has served as a repertory of fallacies, and it is probably a chief source of Spencer. (3) Spencer's *Essay on Education* (1858-60), mainly an elaboration of the fallacy (anticipated by Plato, *Rep.*, 438E) that knowledge of "useful things" is for educational purposes necessarily and always the most useful knowledge. To this we may relate the controversies of the fifties and sixties and their prolongation to our own time. See the various papers dating from 1854 on in Huxley's *Science and Education*. The year 1867 marks a date with Mill's *Inaugural and Youmans' Culture Demanded by Modern Life*; and *Essays on a Liberal Education*. Before the discussion of these had died away in America the conflict was rekindled by Charles Francis Adams' *College Fetich*, since which it has been continuous and can very easily be followed in the indices of the *Nation*, the *Atlantic Monthly*, the *Popular Science Monthly*, the various journals of education, the *Independent*, etc. For Germany see Paulsen, *Geschichte des Gelehrten Unterrichts*, II, 441 ff., 595; "Intervention of the Emperor," 620 ff. For France cf. Fouillée, 94, and Translator's Preface, xiii; Weiss, "L'Éducation Classique," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1873, V, 392; Brunetière, "La Question du Latin" (review of Raoul Frary), *ibid.*, 1885, VI, 862; Bréal, "La Tradition du Latin," *ibid.*, CV, 551.

gree passes into a difference of kind.⁶⁵ The truism that Greece and Rome mean less for us than they did for the men of the Renaissance is not even a presumption that they count for little or nothing.⁶⁶ Apart from all technical considerations of curricula, degrees, and educational machinery, it is broadly desirable that classical studies should continue to hold a place in higher education fairly proportionate to their significance for our total culture. They will not hold that place if the representatives of the scientific and "modern" subjects enter into an unholy alliance with the legions of Philistia to swell the unthinking clamor against dead languages and useless studies. Whatever the talking delegates of science may say in their haste, thoughtful scientific men⁶⁷ require no professor of Greek to tell them that the languages and literatures of the 1300 years of continuous civilization from Homer to Julian subtend a far larger arc of the great circle of knowledge than Sanskrit or Zend or the other specialties to which they are so often compared. Whether they hold this place by their intrinsic

⁶⁵ So already Gildersleeve in 1868 (p. 10): "Sydney Smith's complaint of 'Too much Latin and Greek' has become the war-cry, 'Little Latin and no Greek at all.'"

⁶⁶ For this common *non sequitur* cf. Zielinski, *op. cit.*, 15; Huxley, *op. cit.*, 149; Macaulay, *passim*. The argument is used already by Descartes.

⁶⁷ I cite a few names at random: Berthelot, *Science et Morale*, 125, favors two types of education, "l'un fondé essentiellement sur les lettres anciennes," etc. Lord Kelvin, in his *Life* by Thompson, p. 1115: "I think for the sake of mathematicians and science students Cambridge and Oxford should keep Greek, of which even a very moderate extent is of very great value." Humboldt's and Emil du Bois Reymond's views are well known (Fouillée, *op. cit.*, 177). See also President A. C. Humphreys in *Proceed. Forty-Eighth Ann. Commence. Penn. State Coll.*, 44. Josiah Cook, *Pop. Sci. Mo.*, XXIV, 1 ff. Frederick B. Loomis, *Independent*, LIX (1905), 486. Cf. Whitman, Barnes, Pierce, Dabney, Dana in the symposium of April 3, 1909. The hostile testimony (e.g., of Nef) refers largely to required or excessive classics. Cf. the fine words of Huxley, *Science and Education*, 98 and 182. Tyndall, *Fragments of Science* ("Home Library"), 415. Thayer in *St. Louis Congress*, VI, 218: "When in the period of so-called secondary education it is proposed to substitute the study of the natural sciences for a good training in the humanities, there is danger of drying up some of the sources from which this very scientific expansion has sprung." For German scientific men see Holmes, *Nat. Rev.*, XLII, 103 ff.

beauty and sublimity,⁶⁸ by "the grand simplicity of their statement of the everlasting problems of human life,"⁶⁹ by their disciplinary value, by their enormous contribution of facts to the mental and moral and historical sciences⁷⁰ and the "wisdom of life,"⁷¹ by their renewal of the intellectual life of Europe at the Renaissance and yet again at the German revival and reorganization of science at the close of the eighteenth century, or as the sources and inspiration of modern literature⁷² and by their still dominant influence in the greatest English poets of the nineteenth century or by all these things together, matters not. They hold the place, and they cannot be relegated to the position of erudite specialities without an emasculation of our discipline and an impoverishment of our culture.⁷³

But controversy like all literary forms tends to stereotype itself. Educational conventions still echo to denunciation of abuses as obsolete as the Inquisition. Language that would be an exaggeration if used of the most hide-bound old-style, Latin verse writing English public school, the narrowest French *lycée*, is applied to "the tyranny of the classics" in high schools where the teacher is forbidden to use the Bible and is applauded for taking the daily newspaper as a textbook. The

⁶⁸ Jebb, 529; Mill, *op. cit.*, IV, 352: "Compositions which from the altered conditions of human life are likely to be seldom paralleled in their sustained excellence by the times to come."

⁶⁹ Huxley, *Science and Education*, 98.

⁷⁰ For the propaedeutic implicit or indirect educational values of classical study cf. Shorey in *School Rev.*, V, 226-27; the illustrations drawn from his own teaching by Zielinski, *op. cit.*, 99 ff. ("Ein Philolog kann alles brauchen"); Shorey, "Philology and Classical Philology," *Class. Rev.*, I, 182-83 ff.; Matthew Arnold's charming "Speech at Eton," *Irish Essays*, V; Wenley, "The Nature of Culture Studies," *School Rev.*, June, 1905.

⁷¹ Mill, *op. cit.*, IV, 354 ff.; Gildersleeve, *op. cit.*, 21; Jebb, *op. cit.*, 540.

⁷² Jebb, *op. cit.*, 54; *infra*, p. 612.

⁷³ Cf. among countless quotable utterances to this effect from the chief writers of the nineteenth century, Richter cited by Zielinski, *op. cit.*, 109, and Laurie, *op. cit.*, 186: "Mankind would sink into a bottomless abyss if our youth on their journey to the fair of life did not pass through the tranquil and noble shrine of antiquity." Froude, *Words About Oxford*: "This would be to exclude ourselves from an acquaintance with all past time except in monkish fiction," etc.

protests of French liberals against the former official requirement of a classical education for access to all professions and public offices are transferred to American conditions to which they are wholly inapplicable.⁷⁴ The arguments of Sydney Smith denouncing compulsory Latin verse writing and of Macaulay holding a brief for the University of London against the obstructionist prejudices of Oxford or elaborating a false antithesis between the Baconian and the Platonic philosophy are taken from the context⁷⁵ and used in support of policies which Sydney Smith and Macaulay would have been the first to deplore.

It is time to recognize that the work of Huxley, Tyndall, Spencer, Youmans, and President Eliot has been done once for all. "The mere man of letters who affects to ignore and despise science" may have existed in Huxley's England. Today he is as extinct as the dodo. The "enemies of science" of whom Professor Lankester complains are speech automatisms surviving in the rhetoric of science.

The victory of our scientific colleagues is overwhelming, and the Cinderella⁷⁶ pose is an anachronism.⁷⁷ Huxley was fighting to reform schools in which all boys, whatever their tastes, were compelled to compose Latin verses, and in which, as he said, with gross but then pardonable exaggeration, twelve years' hard study of Greek left the victim unable to construe a page of easy prose. And so today professors of science who are not quite Huxleys step out of their palatial laboratories and splendidly equipped offices to thunder against the obstruction of modern progress by classics in schools where not 2 per cent of the students learn the Greek alphabet, where no one is required to study Latin, and few do study it more than two or three years. They forget that if Huxley were with us today he would probably be pleading for

⁷⁴ See Shorey in *Proc. 5th Conf. Assoc. Am. Univ.*, 70.

⁷⁵ E.g., by Woodward, *Proceedings Am. Assoc. for Adv. of Sci.*, 1907; cf. *Indep.*, LXII, 107; and by H. W., "The Battle of the Books," *Westminster*, CLX; 425 ff.

⁷⁶ Spencer, *op. cit.*, 87, copied by all his successors.

⁷⁷ "It seems clear that science nowadays is proud and not literature."—Fouillée, *op. cit.*, 59.

a revival of classical studies.⁷⁸ Whatever the grievances of the past, present attacks on the classics are inspired by the revolt against discipline and hard work, the impatience of all serious pre-vocational study, the demand for quick utilitarian results, and absorption in the up-to-date.⁷⁹ Our scientific colleagues who invoke these sentiments against us will find that they are playing with fire and enlisting allies whom they cannot control. The public will see no logical halting-place between their position and that of Mr. Crane of Chicago. The boy whom they have encouraged to shirk the discipline of Latin will find mathematics and physics still more irksome. The professional constituency of engineers and chemical experts they will retain. But the majority will go snap hunting in the happy fields of English literature and the social sciences. Let not our scientific colleagues deceive themselves. They are more allied to us by the severity and definiteness of their discipline than divided by differences of matter and method. In the fundamental classification of studies into those which exercise and those which titillate the mind they belong with us. You cannot really teach anything by lectures, experience meetings, heart-to-heart talks, the pseudo-Socratic method, and expansion of the student's personality. But you cannot even pretend to teach classics and the exact sciences in this way. In these days that is a bond. As serious workers and teachers you belong with us. The allies whom you encourage to sap our discipline with the "soft moisture of irrelevant sentimentality" will not stop there. They are past masters in what Mrs. Wharton calls the art of converting second-hand ideas into first-hand emotions. They will humanize your cold abstract sciences in a way that will surprise you. I quote from the report of a recent educational conference:

At 3 P.M. Miss N. Andrews, principal of the Happy Grove Girls' School, conducted a regular junior class meeting. A very helpful feature of this meeting was an illustration by the use of iodine and hyposulphite of soda,

⁷⁸ Cf. the enormous concession in *Science and Education*, 153.

⁷⁹ Cf. the brilliant and caustic paper by Mrs. Emily James Putnam in *Putnam's*, III, 418; Zielinski, *op. cit.*, 206.

showing how sin defiles the heart, and how the blood of Jesus can cleanse it.

When this generation of kindergarten Christian Scientists arrives in your laboratories you will wish too late that they had been set to gnaw the file of Latin grammar for a year or two.⁸⁰ You will find a new meaning in Professor Karl Pearson's statement⁸¹ that the most valuable acquisitions of his early education were the notions of method which he derived from Greek grammar.⁸² You will admit that after all there may be something in Anatole France's warning that since the methods of science exceed the limitations of children the teacher will confine himself to the terminology. You will be able to interpret Brunetière's remark that neither infancy nor youth can support the intoxication with which science at first dazes its neophytes, and you will sadly verify the accomplishment of George Eliot's prophecy of a generation "dizzy with indigestion of recent science and philosophy."

Such terms as "culture," "discipline," "utility," a "liberal" education have been much bandied about in idle controversy.⁸³ They are all, perhaps, equivocal or question-begging, and hardly admit of authoritative definition. Yet you all understand them well enough to know what I mean by saying that the study of the exact sciences yields utility, discipline, and a kind of culture; that classics give culture, discipline, and a kind of utility; and that today they are conjointly opposed to a vast array of miscellaneous "free electives" which are more popular largely because as at present taught they demand and impart neither discipline nor culture nor utility, but only information, entertainment, and

⁸⁰ Cf. Sadler in *School Rev.* (1906), 403: "What . . . can be done in a subject such as physiology when," etc.

⁸¹ *Grammar of Science.*

⁸² Cf. also Fouillée, *op. cit.*, 66, top.

⁸³ Cf. Huxley, *op. cit.*, 141, on "Real Culture"; Flexner in *Science*, XXIX, 370; Frederick Harrison's satire on Arnold's "Culture and Anarchy," with Arnold's reply; Youmans' "The Culture Demanded by Modern Life"; *Essays on a Liberal Education*, Macmillan, 1867; Newcomb, "What is a Liberal Education?" in *Science*, III, 435; Woodward in *Science*, XIV, 476; Huxley, *op. cit.*, 86; Mrs. Emily James Putnam, *Putnam's*, III, 421.

intellectual dissipation. These studies fall into two chief groups, the demi-sciences, that is, the so-called moral and social sciences, and modern linguistic and literary studies. I intend no disparagement by the term demi-sciences. There is no higher university work than pioneer exploration of subjects not yet definitely constituted as sciences. But the personal magnetism in the classroom of a Giddings, a Small, a Vincent, a Ross, a Cooley should not blind us to the fact that these studies demand, as Plato said,⁸⁴ the severest, not the loosest, preparatory training, and that, "freely elected," without such preparation, they will merely muddle the mind of the average American undergraduate.

The outspoken expression of this opinion, which the majority of classicists share, threatens to convert the old warfare of science and classics into a conflict between classics and the social sciences.⁸⁵ For the history of this merry war we cannot delay. One point only concerns us here. Sociology and the new psychology have staked out the entire coast of the unknown continent of knowledge and claim all the hinterland. Abstractly and a priori this is plausible enough. An infinite psychologist could pronounce on the credibility of a witness, advise infallibly on the choice of a vocation, and prescribe the proper intellectual diet for every idiosyncrasy. In a finite psychologist it is—well, this is an age of advertising.

Like claims could be made for an abstract or ideal sociology. Education is preparation for life, and human life and mind exist and develop only in and through society.⁸⁶ After the psychologist has annexed everything else, the sociologist may logically swallow him, while the physiologist lies in wait for both. They may be left to fight that out—a hundred or a thousand years hence.

⁸⁴ Cf. my paper on "Some Ideals of Education in Plato's Republic," *Educational Bi-Monthly*, February, 1908.

⁸⁵ Many representatives of the mental and moral sciences, of course, recognize that classics are still the best available propaedeutic for them; notably Fouillée, and with some reserves Giddings.

⁸⁶ To readers of Plato's *Protagoras* and *Republic*, there is something supremely funny in the statement that "the most important general advance [in psychology from 1881 to 1906] seems to be the recognition that the mind of the human adult is a social product."—E. Ray Lankester, *The Kingdom of Man*, 122.

But today there is no science of psychology,⁸⁷ sociology, or pedagogy that can pronounce with any authority on either the aims or the methods of education.⁸⁸ The confident affirmations of our colleagues in these departments are not, then, to be received as the pronouncements of experts, but as the opinions of observers who like ourselves may be partisans.⁸⁹

Throughout this discussion I have taken for granted the general belief of educators, statesmen, and the man in the street, from Plato and Aristotle to John Stuart Mill, Faraday,⁹⁰ Lincoln,⁹¹ President Taft,⁹² and Anatole France, that there is such a thing as intellectual discipline, and that some studies are a better mental gymnastic than others. This, like other notions of "common-sense," is subject to all due qualifications and limitations. But it is now denied altogether, and the authority of Plato, Mill, Faraday, or Lincoln is met by the names of Hinsdale, O'Shea, Bagley, Horn, Thorndike, Bolton, and DeGarmo. Tastes in authorities differ. But these gentlemen are cited, not as authorities, but as experts who have proved by scientific experiment and ratiocination that mental discipline is a myth. There is no such proof, and no prospect of it. There are in general no laboratory experiments that teach us anything about the higher mental processes which we cannot observe and infer by better and more natural methods.⁹³ Still less are there any

⁸⁷ Cf. Jowett's *Plato*, IV, 175, "On the nature and limits of Psychology."

⁸⁸ Cf. Zielinski, *op. cit.*, 23; James, *Talks to Teachers*, 130-37; Anatole France, *Le Jardin d'Épicure*, 218: "Quand la biologie sera constituée, c'est à dire dans quelques millions d'années, on pourra peut-être construire une sociologie"; Shorey, *Class. Jour.*, I, 187; *St. Louis Congress*, III, 370, 375-76.

⁸⁹ Observe the disinterested scientific temper in which Superintendent Harris discusses the psychology of formal discipline: "But Greek is already a vanishing element in our secondary schools, and it needs but a few more strokes to put it entirely *hors de combat*."—*Education*, XXV, 426.

⁹⁰ *Culture Demanded by Modern Life*, 200.

⁹¹ See Croly, *Promise of American Life*, 91-92.

⁹² *Bryn Mawr Alumnae Quarterly*, IV, No. 2, 79.

⁹³ Inserting needles into holes, estimating areas, drawing with the hand hidden behind a screen, etc., etc., are all falsifying simplifications of the infinitely complex problem to the solution of which they may or may not lead in the years to come. Nor despite Dr. Dawson's warning against "neurones and con-

that can even approximate to the solution of the complicated problem of the total value and effect of a course of study. There is no authentic deliverance of science here to oppose to the vast presumption of common-sense and the belief of the majority of educated and practical men.⁹⁴ And we are therefore still entitled to ask, If you reject the classics and the elective system is a failure, what are you prepared to substitute?⁹⁵ Theoretically there are alternatives which, not being a fanatic, I would gladly see organized into a rational group system.⁹⁶ But the practical alternative which anti-classical fanaticism at present offers is formulated by one of your own faculty with the unconscious irony of italics as "*Anything and everything connected with*

necting fibres fashioned through and through for the study of the Latin language," do we know enough about "localization of function" to argue the question intelligently on this basis. The leading opponents of the idea of mental discipline, whenever they forget themselves, all take it for granted, or make self-stultifying concessions to it.

⁹⁴ Cf. Zielinski, *op. cit.*, 12, 22; Plato, *Republic*, 526B, 527D. There is no space to continue the discussion here. But I doubt whether many competent psychologists will be willing seriously to maintain that serious results have as yet been achieved. The whole recent "unsettlement of the doctrine of formal discipline" took its start as a polemical move and not as a disinterested scientific investigation. And it still bears the impress of its origin. It was perhaps suggested by Youmans' essay on "Mental Discipline in Education," introductory to *The Culture Demanded by Modern Life*. Cf. O'Shea, *Education as Adjustment*, ix: "My chief motive . . . is to try to show that the doctrine of formal training, etc., etc."; Heck, *Mental Discipline and Educational Values*, I, strangely says, after Monroe, that the doctrine of formal discipline was first clearly formulated in the seventeenth century in defense of classical studies. Professor Bagley, *The Educative Process*, 211, gravely alleges against the doctrine his experience that a year of habituation to hard work at his desk did not discipline him out of a disinclination to regular work on the farm in his summer vacation. This may pair off with the "experiments" which show that students who are compelled to prepare neat papers in one subject will not spontaneously take the same extra pains in other classrooms (*ibid.*, 208).

⁹⁵ Cf. Lowell, *Prose Works*, VI, 166: "We know not whither other studies will lead us. . . . We do know to what summits . . . this has led and what the many-sided outlook thence."

⁹⁶ Cf. Fouillée, *op. cit.*, 151-52, and Shorey, in *Proceedings of the Fifth Conference of the Associations of American Universities* (February, 1904, 66-67), and in the *Proceedings of the International Congress of Education* (Chicago, 1893, 138).

modern life"—a large order.⁹⁷ Professor King would of course know how to apply this formula with discretion. But he would perhaps be somewhat dismayed to see how it is applied in the short course of the Cokato High School by an enthusiastic convertite who declares that "we are doing some intensive work in spots out in this state regardless of college requirements in English or any other requirements this side of the moon."

The modern literary and linguistic group of studies presents no problem in theory. There may be some question how much Latin those students whose education ends with the high school can afford to take. But the more advanced collegiate and university study of English, modern languages, history, and philosophy without any preparation in classics is a sorry jest.⁹⁸ The teachers themselves are aware of this when not misled by departmental rivalries or cowed by fatalistic acquiescence in the low standards which the spoiled American boy and the indulgent American parent are forcing upon our schools.⁹⁹ They too must be brought to realize that the cause of the higher culture is one and their lot is bound up with ours.¹⁰⁰ Our colleagues in modern languages have had their warning from President Schurman. They cannot join the hue and cry against dead classics and retain their séminars in Dante and Old French and their culture courses in Racine and Goethe. For the practical man Corneille and Lessing are as dead as Homer and

⁹⁷ *Educational Review*, XXXIII, 469. For a good criticism of this ideal, cf. T. E. Page, in *Edinburgh Review*, XXXIV, 144; Fouillée, *op. cit.*, 136 ff.

⁹⁸ See Churton Collins, "Greek at the Universities," *Fortnightly* (1905), 260-71.

⁹⁹ Cf. Grandgent, "French as a Substitute for Latin," *School Review*, XII, 462-67; Warren, *Methods of Teaching Modern Languages*, 114: "The first duty of modern language instructors is to preserve as far as possible the advantages derived from the study of the displaced languages, Greek and Latin." As Fouillée says (p. 156), the alternative is either the hotel waiter's cheap polyglotism or the study of living languages by the critical methods applied to the languages called dead. Cf. Jebb, *op. cit.*, 558. Lowell, *op. cit.*, 156: "In a way that demands toil and thought . . . as Greek and Latin, and they only, used to be taught."

¹⁰⁰ Lowell, *op. cit.*, 157.

Aristotle. His only use for French is "to fight the battle of life—with waiters in French restaurants." Cornell University, possessing the finest Dante library in the country, had not a single student of Dante in 1904.¹⁰¹ After Greek, Latin, and after Latin, all literary, historical, and philological study of French and German. Convert your departments into Berlitz schools of languages. It is that which you are educating the public to demand, and that is all your students will be capable of. They already complain that anything older or harder than Labiche is difficult and useless.¹⁰²

The teachers of English may lay the same warning to heart. Shakespeare is the belated bard of feudalism. Milton's diction is as obsolete to the readers of Mr. George Ade as his theology. Tennyson is a superannuated representative of the Mid-Victorian compromise. Literature dates from Robert Louis Stevenson; and Mr. Bernard Shaw, Mr. Wells, and Mr. Chesterton are not only clever fellows and shrewd advertisers, but profound thinkers. The Bible, too, is an obsolete and forgotten classic. There is nothing that the unhappy teachers of English can presuppose today. They have sowed the wind and are reaping the whirlwind. Here is a letter recently addressed to the dramatic critic of a great newspaper:

I would like to undertake a course of reading on the literature of the stage. . . . I don't want to be directed to Shakespeare, or the Greek dramatists, or to Bell's *British Theatre* or to any other compendium of chestnuts that a man with any healthy interest in life would rather saw

¹⁰¹ Forman, *op. cit.*, 15.

¹⁰² Whatever may be said of the difficulty of Latin syntax or Greek irregular verbs, it is no paradox to maintain that the ancient classics are more simple, sane, direct, and lucid, and therefore not only a better educational instrument but easier than the masterpieces of modern literature would be if seriously taught. Cf. Gildersleeve, *op. cit.*, 73; Fouillée, *op. cit.*, 124: "not universally intelligible"; *ibid.*, 158 ff. Shelley's "Prometheus" is harder and more confused than that of Aeschylus. Brunetière, *Question du latin*, 872: "Dante est trop subtil, Shakespeare est trop profond, souvent aussi trop obscur; Goethe est trop savant," etc. So Goldwin Smith *apud* Taylor, 355. Illuminating in this connection is Professor Canby's experience that the despised eighteenth-century Latinized English classics are better for teaching than the Elizabethans or the Romantics. See *Nation* (August 4, 1910), 99.

wood than read.¹⁰³ I love the theatre and would like to extend my knowledge if any of the live stuff is in print."

There you have the answer to Huxley's oft-repeated argument: "If an Englishman cannot get literary culture out of his Bible, his Shakespeare, and his Milton, neither in my belief will the profoundest study of Homer and Sophocles, Virgil and Horace, give it to him." The question is not whether an Englishman can, but whether the American student will, if the universities encourage the spirit of philistinism to create an atmosphere in which the study of Homer and Sophocles cannot live.¹⁰⁴ You may perhaps reduce classical studies to the position of Sanskrit and Zend and Hebrew. If you do, we shall faithfully hand on the torch of true scholarship to the audience fit and few that remains, and watch with amusement your attempts to teach the history, philology, and higher criticism of English literature in the environment that you have helped to create.¹⁰⁵ In short, as we said to our scientific colleagues, that the case of the classics is the case of serious discipline in education, so we warn the representatives of the modern humanities that the cause of all humane culture and historic criticism is bound up with the studies that were the first and remain the highest humanities.

There is something to be said for the view that Tennyson, Milton, Goethe, Dante, and Racine are as obsolete as Virgil and Sophocles, and that the modern man's sole requirements are technical experts cheaply hired, indexes to "hold the eel of science by the tail," the command of a "nervous," colloquial English style, a "typewriter girl" to correct his spelling, and a vaudeville to relax his mind. But there is very little to be said for the endeavor to rear a vast fabric of historic and literary

¹⁰³ Clearly a disciple of Spencer, who after reading six books of the *Iliad* to "study superstitions" "felt that I would rather give a large sum than read to the end."

¹⁰⁴ Cf. *Pop. Sci. Mo.*, XVII, 150: "If I had my way in the halls of education, I would not only dismiss Latin and Greek, but send off packing with them the historical and comparative study of English itself."

¹⁰⁵ Cf. the wail of Gayley, "The Collapse of Culture," in *Idols of Education*; Barrett Wendell's rueful confessions in *The Mystery of Education*.

scholarship in our universities without laying the indispensable foundations. Our culture might conceivably forego the first-hand knowledge of the supreme literary masterpieces of the world. We might sit down in stolid ignorance of the thousand years of uninterrupted civilization from Aeschylus to Claudian. We might renounce the historical study of the Middle Ages. But that would only be the beginning of our losses. The languages, the literatures, the philosophy, the whole higher spiritual tradition of the past four hundred years are unintelligible without this key.¹⁰⁶ It is impossible to explain this to those who have not already in some measure, however slight, verified it in their own experience. The detail is too enormous. The books and essays to which I could refer you only skim the surface of the subject.¹⁰⁷ Anything that we could add here would be superfluous for those who know, and of those who will not believe or who cannot divine what we are hinting at we can only say with Doctor Johnson, "Sir, their ignorance is so great that I am afraid to show them the bottom of it." They are not initiated. They do not understand the *lingua franca* of European culture. Its vocabulary, its terms of art and criticism, its terminology of science and philosophy, charged with the cumulative associations of three thousand years, are for them the arbitrary counters of a mechanically memorized Volapük. The inspirations, the standards of taste, the canons of criticism, the dialectic of ideas, of the leaders of European civilization for the past four centuries are non-existent for them. They cannot estimate the thought of their own or any other generation, because they do not know how to distinguish its peculiar quality from the common inheritance.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Brunetière, "La question du latin," *Revue des deux mondes*, 1885, VI, 862 ff.; Clapp, *op. cit.*, 97-98; Shorey, "Relations of Classical Literature to Other Branches of Learning," *St. Louis Congress* (1904), III, 377-85.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. the bibliography in Shorey, *supra*; Zielinski, *Our Debt to Antiquity*; Mahaffy, "What Have the Greeks Done for Civilization?"; Jebb, *Essays and Addresses*, 541-42, 560; Gildersleeve, *op. cit.*, 23, 44, 60; Churton Collins, *The Study of English Literature*, (Macmillan, 1891). Lowell, VI, 166: "Greek literature is also the most fruitful comment on our own"; 174: "the bees from all climes still fetch honey from the tiny garden-plot of Theocritus" (cf. Kerlin's Yale dissertation, "Theocritus in English Literature").

Literature and history are to their apprehension all surface. The latent meanings, the second intentions, the allusions and the pre-suppositions escape their sense. They do not divine the existence of the deeper currents.

So much for the ideal. But will the average graduate get all this? No, but he will get something, and the total culture of our country will get more. What will the average school boy get, or the average business man retain, of science?

Once more, let us compare either ideals with ideals or actualities with actualities. We are not saying that it is a great thing for our undergraduates to know a little classics. We are saying that it is a monstrous thing that they should not know any.¹⁰⁸ It is deplorable to have been taught Latin badly, to have forgotten how to read Virgil or Cicero with pleasure, and to vent your pique in denunciation of the only studies whose loss you seem to regret. But to have had no Latin at all practically means that you do not know the logic or understand the categories of general grammar and those forms of language which are at the same time forms of thought; that you do not know and cannot safely learn from a lexicon the essential and root meanings of English vocables, and can therefore neither use them with a consciousness of their prime sensuous force¹⁰⁹ nor guard yourself against mixed metaphor;¹¹⁰ that you are mystified by the variations of meanings in like Latin derivations in Shakespeare, the Romance languages, and modern English; that you have no historic feeling for the structure of the period which modern prose inherited from Isocrates through Cicero; that the difficulty of learning French or Italian is tripled for you,¹¹¹ and the possibility of really under-

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Harris, "A Brief for Latin," *Educational Review*, XVII, 313.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Pater, "On Style," *Appreciations*, 13, 17. It is hardly necessary to answer President Hall's cavil that an obtrusive consciousness and a pedantic use of etymology may sometimes be harmful.

¹¹⁰ Gildersleeve, *op. cit.*, 25.

¹¹¹ It is an exaggeration rather than a misrepresentation when Mill speaks (*op. cit.*, IV, 345) of "that ancient language . . . the possession of which makes it easier to learn four or five of the continental languages than it is to learn one of them without it." On the greater ease with which classicists acquire the languages of India cf. Postgate, in *Fortnightly*, LXXII, 857.

standing them forever precluded;¹¹² that you have no key to the terminology of science and philosophy, to law and international law Latin, and Latin maxims,¹¹³ druggists' Latin, botanists' Latin, physicians' Latin; that you cannot even guess the meaning of the countless technical phrases, familiar quotations, proverbs, maxims, and compendious Latin formulae that are so essential a part of the dialect of educated men that the fiercest adversaries of the classics besprinkle their pages with misprints of them;¹¹⁴ that you cannot study the early history of modern science and philosophy, or read their masterpieces in the original texts;¹¹⁵ that Rome is as remote for you as China; that Virgil, Horace, and Cicero are mere names; that French literature is a panorama without perspective, a series of unintelligible allusions;¹¹⁶ that travel in Italy loses half its charm; that you cannot decipher an inscription on the Appian way, in the Catacombs, in Westminster Abbey, on Boston Common, or on the terrace of Quebec, or verify a quotation from St. Augustine, the Vulgate, the Mass, Bacon, Descartes, Grotius' *On War and Peace*, or Spinoza's *Ethics*, to say nothing of consulting the older documents of English law and institutions, the sources of the civil law, on which the laws of Europe and Louisiana are based, the *Monumenta Rerum Germanicarum*, or Migne's patrologia, or reading a bull of the Pope or a telegram of the German emperor; that, not to go back to Milton and the Elizabethans, who are unintelligible without Latin, you cannot make out the texts from which

¹¹² "Le latin c'est la raison du français."—Vinet; cf. Gildersleeve, *op. cit.*, 34.

¹¹³ Foster, *School Rev.* (1909), 377; Scott, *ibid.*, 498–501.

¹¹⁴ See the works of President Stanley Hall and President Jordan, *passim*; Fouillée, *op. cit.*, 126; Gildersleeve, on Bigelow, *op. cit.*, 9.

¹¹⁵ "I should like my aspirant to be able to read a scientific treatise in Latin, French, or German, because an enormous amount of anatomical knowledge is locked up in those languages."—Huxley, *Technical Education*, 409; cf. 187. Huxley himself was not happy until he got Greek. Half of Whewell's plea for the study of the history of science in *The Culture Demanded by Modern Life* is concerned with antiquity, and many of the authors mentioned in the other half wrote in Latin.

¹¹⁶ Cf. René Doumic, "L'enseignement du latin et la littérature française," in *Études sur la litt. franç.* I; Bréal, "La tradition du latin," *Revue des deux mondes*, CV, 551 ff.

Addison's *Spectator* discourses, you do not know half the time what Johnson and Boswell are talking about; that Pope and all of the characteristic writers of the so-called Golden Age are sealed books to you; that you are ill at ease and feel yourself an outsider in reading the correspondence of Tennyson and Fitzgerald, or that of almost any educated Englishman of the nineteenth century, and even in reading Thackeray's novels; that half of Charles Lamb's puns lose their point; and that when Punch alludes to the pathetic scene in which Colonel Newcome cries "absit omen!" for the last time, you don't see the joke.

If our scientific colleagues, forgetting outworn polemics and on sober second thought, assure us that the jealous requirements of their stern mistress demand this sacrifice, we can make no reply. Let them deal with purely scientific education and with its symbol, the B.S. degree, in their discretion. But let us hear no more of the farce of a literary, a philosophical, or a historical education that omits even the elements of the languages and literatures on which all literary and historical studies depend for men of European descent. Our acquiescence in such a "collapse of culture" is due to our supine and fatalistic acceptance of the disgracefully low standards which the abuse of the elective system and the premature distraction of the socially precocious and intellectually retarded American boy by the dissipations of modern life and society have imposed upon us. Mill may have overestimated the powers of acquisition of the human mind, but he was far nearer right than we are, who bestow degrees on students who have merely deigned to listen to a few chatty lectures on "anything and everything connected with modern life."

The talk of ten or twelve years' ineffectual study of Latin and Greek is nonsense or misrepresentation. It is an indictment of human nature and bad teaching, not specially of classical studies. Undisciplined students will doubtless dawdle over anything, from French to mathematics, so long as teachers and parents permit it. But in a serious school one-fourth of the student's time for four or five years is enough for the acquisition, together with the power to read Cicero and Virgil with pleasure,

of more English than classmates who omit Latin will probably learn. It is not a formidable undertaking, except for students whose attention is too dissipated and whose minds are too flabby to master anything that must be remembered beyond the close of the current term. There is and always will be ample room for a reasonable amount of Latin in any rational scheme of studies that extends four or more years beyond the graded schools.

Latin is a necessity in anything but an elementary or purely technical education. Greek is not in this sense a necessity.¹¹⁷ Neither is it a scholastic specialty. It is the first of luxuries, a luxury which no one proposes to prescribe for all collegians, but which ought to be enjoyed by an increasing proportion of those who are now frightened away from it by exaggeration of its difficulty or by utilitarian objections that apply with equal force to the inferior substitutes which partisan advisers recommend in its place. The value and the charm of even a little knowledge of Greek has often been explained,¹¹⁸ and has been repeatedly demonstrated in the courses in beginning Greek offered by American colleges in the past decade. Students of good but not extraordinary ability have, while keeping up their other work, read six books of the *Anabasis* in the first year of study; have completed in three years the A.B. requirements of the University of Chicago, including eight books of the *Odyssey*, two Greek tragedies, and Plato's *Apology* and *Crito*, and have in the fourth year of study read the entire *Republic* of Plato with intelligence and delight. These facts and similar results obtained in other universities are verifiable by any unprejudiced inquirer, and they make it difficult to characterize in parliamentary language the

¹¹⁷ I cannot pause to discuss the misconception of those representatives of science who argue, not quite seriously perhaps, that if only one ancient language is to be studied it should be Greek. This might be true for Mars or China. It is plainly not true for that Europe which was evolved from the Roman empire, and which until the second or German Renaissance received the inspiration of Greece mainly through Latin literature.

¹¹⁸ See Jebb, *op. cit.*, 575-80; "A Popular Study of Greek." President Mackenzie, in *School Rev.* (1908), 376, adds the weighty suggestion that those "who do not possess these weapons of a full Christian culture" will tend to read only what is easy and avoid scholarly works that contain even a few Greek words or Latin quotations.

persistent misrepresentation that eight or ten or twelve years' exclusive study of the classics yields no results comparable to those achieved by the normal student in other studies. In the light of this experience no fair-minded dean or judicious adviser of students already biased by unthinking popular prejudice can refuse in Lowell's words to "give the horse a chance at the ancient springs" before concluding that he will not drink.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁹ *Latest Lit. Essays*, I, 53.